

Appl. No. 10/810,794  
Amdt. dated June 25, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2007

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 60-64 and 66 are presented for consideration.

Claims 1-59 and 65 are withdrawn as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claim 66 is new. Support can be found in the specification at page 20, lines 20-25.

Directing attention to the grounds for rejection, the title is objected to as being non-descriptive. It has been changed to recite a method and now reads "Method for Making Textured Cellulosic Wet Wipes".

Claims 60-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite by having insufficient antecedent basis for "converting the basesheet". To meet this objection, claim 60 has been amended to overcome the antecedent basis objection and to specify that the resulting wet wipes are single-ply. Support can be found generally throughout the specification and specifically in the Examples at page 19, line 26.

Claims 60, 62 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. 5,667,635 to Win et al. Win et al. teaches multi-ply wet wipes made from throughdried basesheets. The plies of the wipes are embossed together around their edges, which makes them more readily dispersible in water. However, claim 60 as amended recites a single-ply wet wipe, which is not taught or suggested by Win et al. Accordingly claims 60, 62 and 64 are patentable over Win et al.

Claims 61 and 63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al. Without addressing the merits of the rejection of claim 61 (refining energy input), it is believed that claim 61 is patentable at least for the reason that it depends from claim 60, which is patentable. Regarding claim 63, however, which is also believed to be patentable for the same reason, it would not have been obvious to crepe the basesheets of Win et al. because creping is known not only to foreshorten the sheet, but also debond and weaken the sheet. Weakening the sheet would be counter to the objective of providing a high level of wet strength.

New claim 66 is also believed to be patentable because Win et al. does not disclose or suggest the specific folding steps found to be advantageous by Applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims are allowable and such action is earnestly solicited.

Appl. No. 10/810,794  
Amdt. dated June 25, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 4, 2007

Please charge any prosecutorial fees which are due to Kimberly-Clark Worldwide, Inc.  
deposit account number 11-0875.

The undersigned may be reached at: (920) 721-3616.

Respectfully submitted,  
PETER J. ALLEN ET AL.

By: 

Gregory E. Croft  
Registration No.: 27,542  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

#### CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I, Judy Garot, hereby certify that on June 25, 2007 this document is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Judy Garot

Signature:

